



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/971,720	10/04/2001	David Ian Houlding	92717-315	3044

7590 07/13/2005

Gary B. Solomon  
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.  
3200 Fountain Place  
1445 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75202-2799

EXAMINER
----------

FOWLKES, ANDRE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/971,720

Applicant(s)

HOULDING, DAVID IAN

Examiner

Andre R. Fowlkes

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-26, 32-34 and 41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-26, 32-34 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/22/05 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-9,11-15,17,18,21, 22, 24-26,32-34 and 41 are pending. Claims 1, 32 and 41 have been amended. Claims 10, 16, 19, 20, 23, 27-31, 35-40 and 42-44 have been canceled.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. The amendment is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 and 37 CFR 1.121 as it appears to be introducing new matter not supported by the original disclosure. The original disclosure does not reasonably convey to a designer of ordinary skill in the art that applicant was in possession of the amended subject matter at the time the application was filed. See *In re Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).

Specifically, there is no support given, from the original disclosure, for the amendments of claims 1, 32 and 41.

Art Unit: 2192

To overcome this objection, applicant may attempt to demonstrate that the original disclosure establishes that he or she was in possession of the amended subject matter or provide the page and line numbers, from the specification, in support of each change in the amended claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-26, 32-34 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beatty et al. (Beatty), U.S. Patent No. 5,913,052 in view of Weinberg et al. (Weinberg) U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962.

As per claim 1, Beatty discloses a system and method for debugging software with an architectural view, and in that, Beatty covers the steps of:

- **accessing a datafile descriptive of the underlying architecture** (col. 6 lines 20-23, "the memory stores (a datafile containing) a plurality of user-selectable architectures corresponding to a plurality of (underlying architectures)"),

- **transforming the datafile to determine architectural components used to form the underlying architecture and rendering, via a visualizer, a plurality of graphical elements representative of the architectural components** (col. 6 lines 23-26, "(The datafile is transformed and then) the display coupled to the memory (i.e. the visualizer), displays (the architectural components of the underlying architecture)"),

- **the graphical elements forming a graphical representation of the underlying architecture** (col. 6 lines 24-25, "a window on the display (includes a

Art Unit: 2192

graphical representation of the underlying) architecture including a graphical device layout”),

**- the graphical representation dependant on a particular mode of a plurality of modes of operation** (Beatty describes how the graphical representation is dependent on a particular mode of a plurality of modes of operation at, col. 3:28-3:43, “In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the system further comprises source software display circuitry that displays a source code representation of the DSP software in a further window on the display ... In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the system further comprises object software display circuitry that displays an object code representation of the DSP software in a further window on the display”),

**- wherein the visualizer is utilized for visualizing the underlying architecture of the software system during conceptual development and deployment phases of the software system** (col. 3:21-23, “Additionally, the present invention allows one or more of the user-selectable architectures correspond to DSPs that do not even exist (i.e. during conceptual development)”, and col. 3:6-16, “the system of the present invention may include an interface between a processor of the general purpose computer and a real (non-emulated) DSP. In this alternative embodiment, the general purpose computer causes the DSP software to execute within the real DSP (i.e. deployment phase)”),

**- wherein the step of visualizing during the conceptual phase of the system is performed by the visualizer operating in a direct simulation mode before the**

**underlying architecture has been implemented in the development and deployment phases** (col. 3:6-16, "the system of the present invention may include an interface between a processor of the general purpose computer and a real (non-emulated) DSP. In this alternative embodiment, the general purpose computer causes the DSP software to execute within the real DSP (i.e. direct interaction simulation mode), in turn causing the real DSP to change states over time. The general purpose computer monitors the states allowing the architectural display circuitry to update at least one field to reflect changes in the states", and col. 3:21-23, "Additionally, the present invention allows one or more of the user-selectable architectures correspond to DSPs that do not even exist (i.e. during the conceptual phase)"),

**- wherein the step of visualizing during the development phases of the system is performed by the visualizer operating in a prototype simulation mode** (col. 3:21-23, "Additionally, the present invention allows one or more of the user-selectable architectures correspond to DSPs that do not even exist (i.e. prototype simulation mode)"),

**- wherein the step of visualizing during the deployment phase of the system is performed by the visualizer operating in an architecture monitor mode**(col. 3:60-65, "In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the architectural display circuitry (i.e. visualizer) allows the user to specify a level of detail regarding the graphical device layout to be displayed in the window (during the architecture monitor mode). The level of detail may be had by zooming in or out or may

be had by displaying more or less DSP architecture detail, depending upon the user's wishes").

Beatty doesn't explicitly disclose **displaying, on a web page, the graphical representation of the underlying architecture.**

However, Weinberg, in an analogous environment, discloses **displaying, on a web page, the graphical representation of the underlying architecture** (Fig. 11, and associated text (e.g. col. 23 line 39 – col. 24 line 25 ), show that the graphical display is a web page).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Weinberg into the system of Beatty to **display, on a web page, the graphical representation of the underlying architecture.** The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted a convenient, universal way to display the graphical information to the user (Beatty, col. 2 lines 27-30).

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **generating a plurality of subsections of the graphical image** (Fig. 4, item 430 and the associated text, (e.g. col. 7 line 11 - col. 8 line 11), describe vertical subsections of the graphical image), **and locating the graphical elements in the subsections as described by the datafile** (col. 2 lines 42-43, "the architecture including a graphical device layout (containing the graphical elements in subsections)").



As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses that **the subsections are displayed as tiers** (Fig. 4, item 430 and the associated text, (e.g. col. 7 line 11 - col. 8 line 11), describe the subsections of the system displayed as vertical tiers).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **providing access to the visualization on a network** (col. 5 lines 12-20, "It should be noted that (this invention may be used with)... computer system/network combinations").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses that **the network is the Internet** (col. 5 lines 12-20, "It should be noted that (this invention may be used with)... computer system/network combinations (i.e. the Internet)").

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **communicating the rendered graphical representation across a network** (col. 5 lines 12-20, "It should be noted that (this invention may communicate the representation across)... computer system/network combinations").

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **receiving data for said rendering from a network connection** (col. 5 lines 12-20, "It should be noted that (this invention may receive data for rendering from)... computer system/network combinations").

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **storing the data** (Fig. 1, item 180, and the associated text (e.g. col. 4 line 41 - col. 2 line 34), show a memory used to store data).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses:

- **providing at least one control on the graphical display and receiving a selection of the at least one control** (col. 6 lines 26-30, "The processor, coupled to the display (provides controls to) simulate operation of the ... software and emulated operation of the (underlying architecture) ... to cause the (underlying architecture) to change states"),

- **performing a graphical operation on the graphical display indicative of dynamic functional operations of the underlying architecture** (col. 6 lines 30-31, "The processor controls the display to update the (graphical display of the underlying architecture in ways indicative of its dynamic functional operations)").

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty doesn't explicitly disclose that **the datafile includes extensible markup language (XML)**.

However, Weinberg, in an analogous environment, discloses that **the datafile includes extensible markup language (XML)** (col. 2 lines 10-13, "the program includes Web site scanning routines ... to gather information about ... HTML (and XML) documents and links of a Web site").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Weinberg into the system of Beatty to have the datafile include extensible markup language. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted the system to understand XML, to be able to collect as much information as possible from the data file, to analyze the software to the fullest extent, in order to enable the maximum optimization of the software and underlying architecture (Beatty, col. 2 lines 27-30).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **executing interactive operations to provide a graphical representation of collaborative interaction between the graphical elements** (col. 6 lines 26-33, "The processor, coupled to the display, simulates operation of the ... software... The processor controls the display to update the (graphical representation to show collaborative interaction between elements)").

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **altering the graphical elements based on a selected configuration of the software system** (col. 6 lines 18-25, "the memory stores a plurality of ... (different graphical elements/systems representative of underlying architecture components and systems) corresponding to (a plurality of software system configurations)", and the graphical elements displayed are altered when a user chooses a different configuration).

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **receiving an event initiated by an operation performed in a second graphical display operating in isolation of actual components of the underlying architecture** (Fig. 4, items 460, 470, and 450 show additional graphical displays used to initiate events, and col. 6 lines 26-33, "The processor, couples to the display, simulates operation of the ... software and emulates operation of the particular (underlying architecture) ... to cause the particular (underlying architecture) to change states"), and **performing an operation on the graphical display based on the event** (col. 6 lines 30-33, "The processor controls the display to update the (representation of the underlying architecture)").

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Beatty discloses **receiving an event initiated by an operation performed in a second**

Art Unit: 2192

**graphical display operating in conjunction with actual components of the underlying architecture** (Fig. 4, items 460, 470, and 450 show additional graphical displays used to initiate events, and col. 6 lines 34-43, "the system of the present invention may include an interface and a real (underlying architecture) ... associated with the computer. In this alternative, the processor causes the ... software to execute within the real (underlying architecture) ... to change states. )"), and **performing an operation on the graphical display based on the event** (col. 6 lines 39-43, "The processor controls the display to update the (graphical representation of the underlying architecture").

As per claims 17 and 18, Beatty/Weinberg also discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claims 2 and 6 above, respectively.

As per claims 21, 22 and 24-26, Beatty/Weinberg also discloses such claimed limitations as addressed in claims 9, 14, 15 and 11 above, respectively.

As per claim 32-34, these are a product version of the claimed method discussed above in claims 1, 5 and 6, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed above and such a product is deemed to be inherent in the Beatty/Weinberg system and method for debugging software, otherwise it would be inoperative.

As per claim 41, Beatty discloses an **application service provider (ASP) system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system** (col. 3:14-19, "In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the system (i.e. ASP) further comprises an architecture database, storable on a storage device of the general purpose computer, that contains a plurality of user-selectable architectures corresponding to a plurality of DSPs (i.e. another distinct system), the system thereby allowing the user to select the particular DSP (to visualize) from the database"),

**- the ASP system comprising:**

**- a datafile including a description of the architecture** (col. 6 lines 20-23, "the memory stores (a datafile containing) a plurality of user-selectable architectures corresponding to a plurality of (underlying architectures)"),

**- a host computing system for transforming the datafile, a visualizer for receiving the transformed datafile and visualizing the architecture** (col. 6 lines 23-26, "(The datafile is transformed by the host system and then) the display coupled to the memory (i.e. the visualizer), displays (i.e. visualizes the architecture)"),

**- the visualizer operating in one of a plurality of modes of operation** (Beatty describes how the graphical representation is dependent on a particular mode of a plurality of modes of operation at, col. 3:28-3:43, "In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the system further comprises source software display circuitry that displays a source code representation of the DSP software in a further window on the display ... In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the system further

Art Unit: 2192

comprises object software display circuitry that displays an object code representation of the DSP software in a further window on the display”),

**- a visual display for receiving and displaying the visualized architecture** (col. 6 lines 24-26, “the (visual) display coupled to the memory (i.e. the visualizer), (receives and) displays (the visualized architecture)”).

**- wherein the visualizer is utilized for visualizing the underlying architecture of the software system during conceptual development and deployment phases of the software system** (col. 3:21-23, “Additionally, the present invention allows one or more of the user-selectable architectures correspond to DSPs that do not even exist (i.e. during conceptual development)”, and col. 3:6-16, “the system of the present invention may include an interface between a processor of the general purpose computer and a real (non-emulated) DSP. In this alternative embodiment, the general purpose computer causes the DSP software to execute within the real DSP (i.e. deployment phase)”),

**- wherein the step of visualizing during the conceptual phase of the system is performed by the visualizer operating in a direct simulation mode before the underlying architecture has been implemented in the development and deployment phases** (col. 3:6-16, “the system of the present invention may include an interface between a processor of the general purpose computer and a real (non-emulated) DSP. In this alternative embodiment, the general purpose computer causes the DSP software to execute within the real DSP (i.e. direct interaction simulation mode), in turn causing the real DSP to change states over time. The general purpose

computer monitors the states allowing the architectural display circuitry to update at least one field to reflect changes in the states”, and col. 3:21-23, “Additionally, the present invention allows one or more of the user-selectable architectures correspond to DSPs that do not even exist (i.e. during the conceptual phase)”),

**- wherein the step of visualizing during the development phases of the system is performed by the visualizer operating in a prototype simulation mode** (col. 3:21-23, “Additionally, the present invention allows one or more of the user-selectable architectures correspond to DSPs that do not even exist (i.e. prototype simulation mode)”),

**- wherein the step of visualizing during the deployment phase of the system is performed by the visualizer operating in an architecture monitor mode**(col. 3:60-65, “In an alternative embodiment of the present invention, the architectural display circuitry (i.e. visualizer) allows the user to specify a level of detail regarding the graphical device layout to be displayed in the window (during the architecture monitor mode). The level of detail may be had by zooming in or out or may be had by displaying more or less DSP architecture detail, depending upon the user's wishes”),

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicants arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive.

*In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:*



1) The Beatty/Weinberg combination does not disclose the new limitations of amended claims 1, 32 and 41, at p. 6:10-22, 7:5-20, 8:1-40 and 9:6-10:4.

*Examiner's response:*

1) The amended claims, and thus all arguments related to new and amended claim limitations, have been addressed in full in the above art rejection of amended claims 1, 32 and 41.

*In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:*

2) Beatty teaches a system with one mode, i.e. a debugging mode. In contrast, the instant invention discloses a system with three modes, i.e. a direct interaction simulation mode, a prototype simulation mode and an architecture monitor mode, at p. 7:15-20.

*Examiner's response:*

2) The examiner disagrees with applicant's characterization of the applied art. The Beatty system discloses performing direct interaction simulation, prototype simulation and architecture monitoring at col. 3:6-6:26 as cited in the art rejection, above.

*In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:*

3) Neither Beatty nor Weinberg teaches a system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system, at p. 10:5-6.

Art Unit: 2192

*Examiner's response:*

3) The examiner disagrees with applicant's characterization of the applied art.

Beatty does disclose a system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system, at col. 3:6-6:26, as cited in the above art rejection.


**Conclusion**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre R. Fowlkes whose telephone number is (571) 272-3697. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ARF

  
TED F. VO  
primary Examiner